

Jerry

From: Jonas, Jill D - DNR [mailto:Jill.Jonas@Wisconsin.gov]

Sent: Monday, January 03, 2011 1:16 PM

To: Smith, Gerald (MDH); Beth Messer; Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Boushon, Lee H - DNR

Subject: RE: Recap REduxp

Hi All,

Yes, we are okay with dropping the 2nd sentence in #2 as suggested by Beth.

Looking forward to seeing the final draft.

Happy 2011 everyone.

Jill

Jill D. Jonas, Director
Bureau of Drinking Water and Groundwater
Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
101 South Webster, PO Box 7921
Madison, WI 53707-7921
phone: (608) 267-7545
fax: (608) 267-7650
jill.jonas@wisconsin.gov

From: Smith, Gerald (MDH) [mailto:Gerald.Smith@state.mn.us]

Sent: Sunday, January 02, 2011 12:43 PM

To: Beth Messer; Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pcarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Jonas, Jill D - DNR; Boushon, Lee H - DNR

Subject: RE: Recap REduxp

Happy New everyone

I have changed the letter to incorporate Beth's comment in paragraph 3.

Regarding the Section 2 comment, I need to defer to Jill and Lee as this was language from their December 15 and 16 email attachments. I am good with dropping from the second bullet "What is needed is a compliance response path for total coliform positives that focuses on GWR responses for the initial confirmed total coliform positive and has an escalated response for additional confirmed total coliform positive results" Jill/Lee are you okay with dropping this sentence? If not can you please address Beth/Mike's questions.

I suggest keeping "state actions" in the first bullet under Section 2.

I had not thought about this until Jill sent me her electronic signature, I am wondering do all the drinking water administrators want to sign the letter electronically or route the letter and sign?

If there are no further comments I will send the final draft to everyone Wednesday for one last review and okay.

Thanks

Jerry

From: Beth Messer [mailto:Beth.Messer@epa.state.oh.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 29, 2010 7:31 AM
To: Kirk Leifheit; Mike Baker; 'pccarroll@idem.in.gov'; 'Eric.Portz@illinois.gov'; 'rick.cobb@illinois.gov'; Richard (DNRE) Benzie; Brock (DNRE) Howard; Carrie (DNRE) Monosmith; Rich (DNRE) Overmyer; Smith, Gerald (MDH); Ellingboe, Randy (MDH); Smude, Robert (MDH); Jill D - DNR Jonas; Lee H - DNR Boushon
Subject: RE: Recap - MI Comments

Hey All,

Mike is out this week, but I got his input on this via email and I've combined our comments. The comments are tracked in the attached. The first comment in paragraph 3 is pretty straightforward.

The other comments are in Section #2. We weren't sure what it was trying to say. I think if you remove the sentences, it still gets the point across. Also in the first bullet under #2, we don't think it needs to refer to state actions again since it's in the above paragraph.

Mike would like to see the final version before sign off.

Thanks,
 Beth

>>> "Overmyer, Rich (DNRE)" <OVERMYERR@michigan.gov> 12/27/2010 3:26 PM >>>

All,

Yes, thanks to everyone for their work on this especially Jerry & Beth. Pat's last draft to Mikes revision looks good. Just note we should be consistent in the "1000 or less" population cutoff (eliminate the "less than 1000"). Also the 3rd bullet under item 4 should be: *Maintain baseline monitoring as quarterly for all groundwater systems serving 1000 or less.* (Not all pws).

1. Is this a draft that we can now share with the Region? YES
2. Is this proposal all or nothing? What happens if US EPA is okay with the simplified monitoring process but does not consider dropping the monitoring and reporting from clean compliance history? NO, NOT ALL OR NOTHING BEING ABLE TO KEEP OUR FIND & FIX PROCESS IS VERY IMPORTANT. HOWEVER, MI ESTIMATES A 60-70% VIOLATION RATE IF MONTHLY MONITORING STAYS IN AS PROPOSED. I SUSPECT THAT WOULD MEAN MASS REFERRALS TO EPA FOR ENFORCEMENT OF MOST M&R VIOLATIONS.
3. By using "significant deficiency" as part of reduced monitoring are we saying it is not necessary to define "sanitary defect"? WE DON'T NEED ANOTHER DEFINITION.
4. Is it okay to drop the following in #2? "Failure to follow Ground Water Rule would trigger a RTCR Level 1 Assessment. A second Level 1 trigger within a rolling 12-month period would trigger Level 1 Assessment and a